## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

**Objection to Claims 4 and 12:**

The 9/21/04 Office Action Objected to claims 4 and 12 and suggested a correction to address an error in the claim. The Examiner's careful review of the claims is much appreciated, and it is respectfully submitted that the above amendments to claims 4 and 12 correct the issue noted by the Examiner.

**Objection To Drawings:**

The 9/21/04 Office Action noted that Fig. 4a referred to a prior design, and as such Fig. 4a should include the caption prior art. The attached replacement sheet provides an amended Fig. 4a, such that this figure now includes the caption "prior art".

**Rejection of Claims:**

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Strachan et al. (the '710 Patent). It is respectfully submitted that as amended herein the pending claims are clearly distinguishable over the '710 patent.

The rejections under the '710 patent, rely in large part of Figures 7 and 10A of the '710 patent. Fig. 10A appears to be cited as showing alternating source regions and drain regions where the drain region face length is greater then the source region face length. In fact it is respectfully submitted that it appears that if one takes into account the three parts of the source region face that are generally orientated to the adjoining drain region then the source region face length appears to be slightly greater than the drain face length. However, to further distinguish the present claims, further language has been added to the independent claims to further distinguish the pending claims over the '710 patent, and the other cited references.

Specifically, amended claims independent claims now recite that the source regions are a contiguous region of first conductivity type. It is respectfully submitted that this is different than the source regions shown in Fig. 10A where the source regions are shown as four separate regions with an X-shaped pattern of a different conductivity type disposed between the separate source regions.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that pending independent claims 1 and 9 are not disclosed or suggested by the '710 patent. Further, claims 2-8 and 10-13 depend from

independent claims 1 and 9 respectively and as such include at least the same limitations as the base independent claims.

Claims 1-13 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Hoshi et al. (the '742 Patent). The rejection of the claims under the '742 Patent rely in large part o Figs. 2 and 3A of the '742 Patent. As noted in the Office Action (page 5) Fig. 3A shows the source regions as being in groups of four. The Office Action goes on to say that for purposes of the Office Action "it is considered only the lower left source region in each group is part of the 'plurality of alternating source regions'." Office Action, page 5. It is respectfully submitted that as amended independent claims 1 and 9 are clearly distinguished from the teaching of the '742 Patent. Specifically, the claims now provide that the source region is a contiguous region of first conductivity type, and that there is only one source region between adjacent drain regions. As recognized in the Office Action, Fig. 3A actually shows multiple source regions between drain regions. Further, Fig. 3A shows that there is no contiguous source region of a first conductivity type, and only a single source region disposed between drain regions. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 and 9 are not disclosed or suggested by the '742 patent.

Claims 9-12 were rejected under 35 USC §102 as being anticipated by Nishibe et al. (the '159 publication). In reviewing the Office Action, and the '159 publication, it is unclear what the length of the face of the drain region is, and what the length of the face of the source region is. It is noted that the Office Action states that: "It is clear that the length of drain region face is at least twice as long as the source region face." Office Action, page 7. In fact, it appears that there is no teaching in the '159 publication would support a conclusion that the drain length is twice as long as source region. If the Examiner is aware of such teaching, it would be appreciated, if such teaching would be cited in the next office action in this matter.

Based on a review of the '159 publication, it appears that Fig. 9 actually shows prior art to the invention of the '159 publication; where the problem being addressed in the '159 publication has to do, in part, with addressing the problem of current crowding in the region A of Fig. 9. (See, '159 publication, ¶007). It appears that a solution from the '159 publication is widening the pbody implant (layer 53) and the field oxide edge (layer 56) as shown in Fig. 8, so as to reduce the current crowding. However, there does not appear to be any suggestion that one should make the drain length greater than the source length.

Thus, it appears that there is nothing in the '159 publication which discloses or suggests claims 1 and 9, or there dependent claims.

**Conclusion**

For the reasons set forth above, it is believed that all claims present in this application are patentably distinguished over the references, and in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration is requested, and it is requested that this application be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

STALLMAN & POLLOCK LLP

Dated: December 7, 2004

By: _____
Brian J. Keating
Reg. No. 39,520

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

Attachment: Submission of Replacement Formal Drawings
w/four sheets of formal drawings

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings includes changes to Fig. 4a These sheets which includes Figs. 1, 2, 3a-b, 4a-b, 5, and 6a-b, replace the original sheets of drawings.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets